12. Yes; I do not mean that it cannot be made by other means?—That is so.

13. You say, "Personally I think not": why not say "No"?—You asked me whether it is possible to make an efficient inspection of a high place without a ladder.

14. Can such an inspection be efficient unless a ladder is used to reach the roof?—No. You mean, in a high place which a man could not otherwise reach?

15. Can an examination be efficient unless a ladder is used?—My answer is, for a high place I personally think not.

16. Why do you say that?—Because I can only use my own knowledge.

17. Then if there is no ladder, under such a condition such an examination is useless: any other examination would be useless?—No, I would not like to say that.

18. Supposing you have got a place 20 ft. high to be examined by a man who has no ladder, how can he make an efficient examination under such conditions?—The examination cannot be so efficient as to enable a man to swear that there was no gas in the roof, but you ask me to say that it is useless.

19. Then there might be a large accumulation of gas undiscovered?—There might.

20. Then, if Wear went through places that were out of his reach without being able to raise his hand to the highest points, and he had no ladder, such an examination would not be a guarantee that there was no gas in those places?—No.

21. And would be useless for all practical purposes for the area out of his reach?—I do not understand the word "practical."

22. For "warning" purposes, then?—It is quite clear that he could not test for gas places which were out of his reach.

23. Did you see a ladder in your walk through—in the high places?—I only saw one ladder in the mine—in the part I went through.

24. How many places did you go into which were too high for a man to reach with a lamp without a ladder: we will find out later how many there are?—That would be hard to say, exactly.

25. Would there be fifty?—No, but I went into perhaps half a dozen such places.

26. You went into half a dozen places in which an efficient test could not be made without a ladder?—A good test for the gas in the roof?

27. That is what I am asking?—Yes.

28. In those half-dozen places would a ladder have enabled an efficient test to have been made for gas?—A sufficient ladder would.

29. Did you see any suitable ladder in the mine to reach the highest places so that an efficient test could have been made for gas?—I did not measure the only ladder I saw.

30. Did you see any suitable ladder in the mine: was the ladder which you saw suitable?—I could not answer that because I did not measure the ladder.

31. Could you not tell us whether the ladder was suitable to reach the highest places you saw?—No, I cannot tell you.

32. Then if there were no ladders where ladders were required to make efficient tests for gas, it is possible that the examiners frequently walked under considerable accumulations of firedamp without knowing it?—It is possible.

33. Is it improbable?—I do not know the conditions of the mine sufficiently to answer that

34. Would the absence of ladders be a reason why any men who were examining the mine at first failed to detect firedamp accumulations which may have started the explosion?—The evidence as I have gathered it would lead me to say that Wear did test up in the roof where the gas was evidently coming from on the Wednesday before the explosion.

35. You mean in the one place where gas came from eventually?—Yes.

36. As to the other parts of the mine you know nothing?—I do not know.

37. Now, it must stand to reason, must it not, that if it is possible for gas to collect in the roofs of the places which are inspected, a man might quite safely walk below the accumulations of firedamp without noticing it?—Clearly gas may be in the roof, if it is a high roof, and a man might walk underneath without noticing it.

38. And might report that particular locality safe, whereas it was dangerous?—That might be so.

39. Now, if you have an accumulation of gas for some time in a given place, will you always on a test being made find afterdamp? Would you after some time find afterdamp?—No.

40. You would not have any afterdamp there under the conditions I have mentioned unless there had been combustion?—No.

41. And if there had been combustion, and the afterdamp was present, but air had been put through it, it is possible that the afterdamp, which is the lightest, would be swept away?—The afterdamp is heavier than air; the firedamp is lighter than air.

42. The afterdamp would not be blown away until the firedamp had been blown away?—No. The afterdamp is heavier and therefore would come out of the cavity in the roof. The firedamp remains up in the roof. The afterdamp would be swept away first; it would not remain in the roof.

43. I want to know the effect of an air-current on afterdamp and firedamp. You mean that only the afterdamp would be swept away?—The afterdamp would be swept away before any firedamp that may be there.

44. Now, do you consider that an examining deputy carrying only one lamp—a safety-lamp—is fully equipped for an efficient examination?—That would depend entirely upon the nature of the workings he had to examine. Are you speaking of the main workings or the old workings?

51. Do you not think an examining deputy should carry more than one safety-lamp for an efficient examination?—Yes.